IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

Crl. Revn. No. 15 of 2001

DATE OF DECISION : 29.08.2006

Ramesh Kumar

.... PETITIONER

Versus

State of Punjab

..... RESPONDENT

CORAM :- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SATISH KUMAR MITTAL

Present: Mr. Karanbir Singh Kahlon, Advocate, for
Mr. D.S. Pheruman, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. N.S. Gill, AAG, Punjab.

* * *

Petitioner Ramesh Kumar has filed this revision petition against the judgment dated 2.9.2000, passed by Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar, whereby the judgment of conviction dated 9.9.1998, passed by Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Amritsar has been upheld and the order of sentence dated 9.9.1998 has been modified by ordering the release of petitioner on probation for a period of one year under Section 4 (1) of the Probation of Offenders Act.

2. The petitioner was tried by the Court of Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Amritsar, in case FIR No. 111 of 1993 under Sections 324/506 IPC registered at Police Station Sadar, Amritsar. Vide judgment and order dated 9.9.1998, passed by the trial court, he was convicted and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for one year and to pay a fine of Rs. 500/- under Section 324 IPC, in default of payment of fine to undergo further rigorous imprisonment for two months and to undergo rigorous imprisonment for one year under Section 506 IPC. In appeal, filed by the petitioner, his conviction has been affirmed and the sentence of imprisonment has been modified by releasing him on probation. Hence, this revision petition has been filed by the petitioner.

3. After hearing the arguments of counsel for the parties and going through the judgments passed by the Courts below, I do not find any

illegality or infirmity in the same. The Courts below have found that the injuries found on the person of the complainant could be from the sharp blade of knife and the delay in lodging the FIR has been fully explained by the prosecution. It has been held by the appellate court that PW2 Jagjit Kumar has corroborated the version of the complainant on all material aspects of the case. I do not find any ground to interfere in the impugned judgments passed by the Courts below.

4. Dismissed.

August 29, 2006 **(SATISH KUMAR MITTAL)**
ndj **JUDGE**